

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JULIA HUBBARD and KAYLA
GOEDINGHAUS,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TRAMMELL S. CROW, JR., DR.
BENJAMIN TODD ELLER,
RICHARD HUBBARD, DR.
MELISSA MILLER, DR. JOSEPH
BROLIN, DR. SCOTT WOODS, DR.
MRUGESHKUMAR SHAH,
MICHAEL CAIN, COE JURACEK,
PHILIP ECOB, H.J. COLE, TEXAS
RANGER CODY MITCHELL, KURT
KNEWITZ, PAUL PENDERGRASS,
RALPH ROGERS, ROBERT PRUITT,
SCOTT BRUNSON, CASE GROVER,
RICHARD BUTLER, MARK
MOLINA, MICHAEL HYNES, JR.,
SHAWN MAYER, JADE MAYER,
RCI HOSPITALITY HOLDINGS,
INC., INTEGRITY BASED
MARKETING, LLC, STORM
FITNESS NUTRITION, LLC, ULTRA
COMBAT NUTRITION, LLC,
ECOLOFT HOMES LLC, ELEVATED
WELLNESS PARTNERS LLC, DOE
INDIVIDUALS 1-20, and DOE
COMPANIES 21-30

Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-7957-FLA-MAA

Hon. Fernando L. Aenlle-Rocha

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
DEFENDANT COE JURACEK'S
MOTION TO DISMISS THE
COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF
PERSONAL JURISDICTION
(12(b)(2)) AND FAILURE TO
STATE A CLAIM (12(b)(6)).**

1 On March 23, 2023, Defendant Coe Juracek filed a motion to dismiss pursuant
2 to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2) and 12(b)(6).

3 This Court finds that Mr. Juracek lacks minimum contacts with California, has
4 not purposefully availed himself of the laws and protections of California, and does
5 not reside in California. Moreover, Plaintiffs have not sufficiently alleged the
6 existence of a single nationwide RICO conspiracy or demonstrated that Texas is not
7 an adequate alternative forum in order to satisfy the provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 1965(b).
8 Accordingly, the Complaint fails to establish any basis for this Court to exercise
9 personal jurisdiction over Mr. Juracek.

10 Additionally, because this Court “may assume the existence of personal
11 jurisdiction and adjudicate the merits in favor of [a] defendant without making a
12 definitive ruling on jurisdiction,” *Koninklijke Philips N.V. v. Elec-Tech Int’l Co.*, No.
13 14-CV-02737-BLF, 2015 WL 1289984, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 20, 2015) (quoting *Lee*
14 *v. City of Beaumont*, 12 F.3d 933, 937 (9th Cir. 1993), the Complaint is dismissed for
15 failure to state a claim. Plaintiffs fail to allege sufficient facts to substantiate a claim
16 for sex trafficking, labor trafficking, or RICO against Mr. Juracek. Furthermore,
17 Plaintiffs have failed to comply with the pleading requirements of Federal Rule of
18 Civil Procedure 8 insofar as the Complaint does not specify conduct attributable to
19 Mr. Juracek that would permit liability on any cause of action.

20 The Court, having considered the motion and finding good cause therefore,
21 hereby GRANTS the motion and orders as follows: The above-captioned action as
22 against Defendant Coe Juracek is dismissed with prejudice.

23
24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25
26 DATED: _____, 2023

27 _____
28 FERNANDO L. AENLLE-ROCHA
United States District Judge